UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/522,201	03/09/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS990858US1	4117

24033   7590   05/26/2004

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
315 S. BEVERLY DRIVE
210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, MAIKHANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/522,201	DUTTA, RABINDRANATH
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Maikhanh Nguyen	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 December 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment A filed 12/15/2003 to the

original application filed 03/09/2000.

2.   Claims 1-27 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 are

independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-20, and 23-27 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable **over LaStrange et al.** (U.S. 5,933,142 – filed 02/1998) as cited by IDS (paper #3).

As to independent claim 1, LaStrange teaches a method for displaying pages in a viewer

program on a computer display monitor *(the display of multiple pages of information within a*

computing system ... display multiple pages of information; col.1, lines 11-15 / display pages on

a computer screen display; col.1, lines 46-59), wherein the viewer program displays an

application window, comprising:

       - downloading a first and second pages from one of multiple servers over a network

(download data from the server or web site to the user's client work station; col.3, lines 6-15);

- automatically concurrently displaying the first page in a first window pane *(both the first page and the second page are now displayed to the user …displaying a first page of information in a first browser window on the display; col.5, lines 21-62)* and the second page in a second window pane in the application window *(two windows simultaneously displayed …a second browser window on the display for displaying the second page of information; col.5, line 34-col.6, line 4)* according to predefined settings specifying how pages are to be displayed in the first and second panes *(the relative size of the browser windows could be controlled either programmatically or by the user; col.4, lines 38-48).*

LaStrange does not explicitly teach "downloading a third page from one of multiple servers over the network; automatically concurrently displaying the third page in one of the first and second panes and one of the first and second pages in the other pane according to the predefined settings; downloading a fourth page from one of multiple servers over the network; and automatically concurrently displaying the third and fourth pages in the first and second panes according to the predefined settings."

LaStrange, however, teaches "the first and the second windows being substantially adjacent to one another …these pages could be overlapped or reduced the size either programmatically or at the user control" (col.4, lines 37-48) and "displays the second web page in the current window by overriding the display of the first web page" (col.5, lines 42-49). In view of LaStrange's teaching, the first and second pages will be overlapped when the third and fourth pages are downloaded and simultaneously displayed on the windows.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply LaStrange's teaching for "downloading a third page from one of

multiple servers over the network; automatically concurrently displaying the third page in one of

the first and second panes and one of the first and second pages in the other pane according to

the predefined settings; downloading a fourth page from one of multiple servers over the

network; and automatically concurrently displaying the third and fourth pages in the first and

second panes according to the predefined settings" because LaStrange's teaching would have

provided the capability for viewing the third and the fourth pages simultaneously on the first and

second windows."

As to dependent claim 2, LaStrange teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to

the left of the second pane, wherein automatically concurrently displaying the third page and one

of the first and second pages comprises concurrently displaying the second page in the first pane

and the third page in the second pane (*col.4, lines 38-48 & col.5, lines 21-62*).

As to dependent claim 5, LaStrange teaches caching previously downloaded pages in

the order in which they were downloaded from the network; receiving a user input command to

display a previously displayed page; and automatically concurrently displaying the previously

displayed page in the first pane and the first page in the second pane according to the predefined

settings in response to the user input command to display the previously displayed page *(col.4,*

lines 38-48 and col.5, lines 21-62).

As to dependent claim 6, LaStrange teaches receiving user selection of a hypertext link

within one of the displayed pages; accessing the page addressed by the hypertext link;

automatically concurrently displaying the page currently displayed in the second pane in the first

pane and displaying the page addressed by the hypertext link in the second pane if the user

selected the hypertext link from the second pane; and automatically concurrently displaying the

page currently displayed in the first pane in the first pane and displaying the page addressed by

the hypertext link in the second pane if the user selected the hypertext link from the first pane

(col.4, lines 38-48 & col.5, lines 21-62).

As to dependent claim 7, LaStrange teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to

the left of the second pane *(Fig.5 and associated text).*

As to dependent claim 8, LaStrange teaches receiving user selection of a hypertext link

within one of the displayed pages in one of the panes; accessing the page addressed by the

hypertext link; and automatically concurrently displaying the page addressed by the hypertext

link in the pane opposite the pane displaying the page from which the hypertext link was selected

the page from which the link was selected in its current pane *(col.4, lines 10-37).*

As to dependent claim 9, LaStrange teaches the viewer program is capable of displaying

the downloaded pages in the first and second panes according to the predefined settings when the

pages downloaded from over the network do not include any page commands to cause the

display of pages in separate panes within the application window *(col.4, lines 38-48).*

As to independent claim 10, it is directed to a system for implementing the method of

claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 11 & 14-18, they include the same limitations as in claims 2 &

5-9, are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to independent claim 19, it is directed to an article of manufacture for implementing

the method of claim 1, and is similarly rejected under the same rationale.

As to dependent claims 20 & 23-27, they include the same limitations as in claims 2 &

5-9, are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

4.   Claims 3-4, 12-13 and 21-22 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable **over LaStrange et al.** in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art** (APA).

As to dependent claims 3, LaStrange teaches caching previously downloaded pages in

the order in which they were downloaded from the network; and automatically concurrently

displaying the previously displayed page in the first pane and the first page in the second pane

according to the predefined settings in response to the user input command to display the

previously displayed page *(col.5, line 21- col.6, line 6).*

LaStrange, however, does not explicitly teach "receiving a user input command to display

a previously displayed page."

APA teaches receiving a user input command to display a previously displayed page

(users can select a "Back" button displayed in the menu bar of the browser window or a mouse

button programmed as the "back" button to review the page previously viewed; Specification,

page 2, lines 15-21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teachings of APA and LaStrange because APA's teaching

would have provided the capability for retrieving and displaying the previously displayed page.

As to dependent claim 4, LaStrange teaches the first pane is displayed adjacent and to

the left of the second pane *(col.4, lines 38-48 & col.5, lines 21-62).*

As to dependent claims 12-13 & 21-22, they include the same limitations as in claims 3-

4, are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but they are not

persuasive.

Applicant argues that *"LaStrange teaches away from automatically concurrently*

displaying the third and fourth pages in the first and second panes, which results in replacing the

first and second pages. " (Remarks, page 11, lines 20-22)

In response, the Examiner contends that LaStrange does teach (col.4, lines 37-48 and

col.5, lines 35-49) automatically (programmatically) concurrently displaying the third and fourth

pages (simultaneously display any number of windows) in the first and second panes, which

results in replacing the first and second pages (displays the second web page in the current

window by overriding the display of the first web page).

As to dependent claims 2-9, 11-18, and 20-27, the arguments are not persuasive for

reason as discussed above with regards to independent claims 1, 10, and 19.

Conclusion

6.   Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Maikhanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-0092.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00am – 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Maikhanh Nguyen
May 25, 2004

JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER